

REMARKS

The present amendment is in response to the Official Action dated April 1, 2008, where the Examiner continues to reject claims 1-24. More specifically, the Examiner has rejected claims 1-4, 6, 12-17, 22 and 24, under 35 USC §103(a) as being unpatentable over Chaskar, US Patent Application Publication No. 2004/0224702, in view of newly cited Coffee et al., US Patent Application Publication No. 2006/0182055; and rejected claims 5, 7-11, 18-21 and 23, under 35 USC §103(a) as being unpatentable over Chaskar, '702, and Coffee et al., '055, further in view of Chan et al., US Patent Application Publication No. 2004/020638. However in reviewing the references in light of the claims as presently pending, the references being relied upon by the Examiner fail to make known or obvious each and every feature of the claims.

More specifically, the combination of references continue to fail to make known or obvious at least a second communication connection being a direct communication connection between the user communication device and the service provider, as provided in independent claim 1; communicating service transaction data directly with the service provider, which is dispatched to a location of the user responsive to the service request and the location information, via the second communication connection upon rendering of the requested service, as provided in independent claim 13; and means for directly communicating service transaction data with a service provider dispatched to a location of the user responsive to the service request and the location information thereby completing a service transaction upon rendering of the service by the service provider, as provided in independent claim 24. In essence, there is no provision for a direct communication connection between a service provider dispatched to the location of the user and the device or apparatus of the user of the service.

While, Coffee et al., '055, may describe a mobile asset management system including provisions for tracking the dispatch of a mobile asset for purposes of providing a service, there is no direct communication between the dispatched service provider and the user communication device, where the user is the user of the service, and/or which would facilitate the communication of service transaction data and/or the completion of a service transaction, via the direct communication connection.

In suggesting Coffee et al., '055, makes known the same, the Examiner makes specific reference to FIGS. 9b and 9c, as well as paragraphs [0349] and [0350]. However in reviewing the cited sections, both elements which communicate via the short range wireless link 108 are

devices under the control and management of the same entity, and provide communication between separated elements of the hybrid hand held/fixed mounted device, which would appear to be associated with the service provider. Assuming that the field technician is equated to the claimed service provider, there is no interaction with any separate entity that could be categorized as a user of the service, and hence there is no teaching of a communication between the user communication device and the service provider (claim 1), or corresponding features from either of the other two independent claims, as noted above. As such, the reference can not be said to account for the acknowledged deficiencies of the primary reference, and the combination of references cited by the Examiner can not be said to make known or obvious each and every feature of the claims.

In view of the present response, the applicant would respectfully request that the Examiner reexamine and similarly reconsider the claims. In absence of a properly presented rejection, allowance of the application is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

BY:Lawrence Chapa/

Lawrence J. Chapa

Reg. No. 39,135

Phone (847) 523-0340

Fax. No. (847) 523-2350

Motorola, Inc.
Mobile Devices
Intellectual Property Department
600 North US Highway 45, W4 35Q
Libertyville, IL 60048